

Mother Assassinated, in 1947, is to resurrected

Towards **AKHAND BHARAT**

Confederation of the Sub-continent
United States of India (USI)

Conceived by Maulana Hasrat Mohani in January 1942

The only *upaye* (उपाय) for the big crime

THE BIG PARTITION MOTHER ASSASSINATED

Remembering the Big Crime:

May be the biggest in history. No use, however, shedding tears and lamenting upon *their follies*. Done is done. Past is past. The great follies, our *pigmies* committed, cannot be undone; may not be undone but may be rectified; that as a result of their follies, we have become a little wiser; that there is a lot still to be done, only the will is required: *will* to find a way. And the way-out is as suggested, time and again by our sages during the pre-partition envisaging a *federal state of India* or United States of India (USI), or Akhand Bharat, both Gandhi and Godse were in union on this point; and both sacrifice their lives for the great cause; and for which, now, a few of us are to dedicate their lives for the Mother who was assassinated in 1947, tantalizing to resurrect, to kiss her *twins*.

For your kind attention: for all footnote references are from “*Mother Assassinated: the Big partition*”, a publication of Khuda Bakhsh Library, Patna; the present material has been reproduced here, by way of **review** of that book.

Gandhiji's remarks may well be our starting point

‘Using a well-known Gujarati metaphor,’ says Pyarelal, ‘he (Gandhiji) likened independence-cum-partition to a “wooden loaf”; “if they (Congress leaders) eat it, they die of colic; if they leave it, they starve”.

- (Pyarelal, *The Last Phase*, vol II, p 210-11). ¹

Gandhi ji in his weekly newspaper Harijan, a week later wrote on 6 April: “Partition means a patent untruth. My whole soul rebels against the idea that Hinduism and Islam represent two antagonist cultures and doctrines. To assent to such a doctrine is for me denial of God. For I believe with my whole soul that the God of the Quran is also the God of the Gita and that we are, no matter by what name designated, children of the same God.”

¹ p. 78

Maulana Azad & Gandhiji : two voices in wilderness, two only: against partition

‘It seems to me that the scheme for Pakistan is a symbol of defeatism and has been build up on the analogy of the Jewish demand for a national home. It is a confession that Indian Muslims cannot hold their own in India as a whole and would be content to withdraw to a corner specially reserved for them. One can sympathize with the aspirations of the Jews for such a national home, as they are scattered over the world and cannot in any region have any effective voice in the administration. The condition of Indian Muslims is quite otherwise. Over 90 million in number they are a quantity and quality a sufficiently important element in Indian life to influence decisively all questions of administration and policy. Nature has further helped them by concentrating them in certain areas.

‘In such context, the demand of Pakistan loses all force. As a Muslim, I for one am not prepared for a moment to give up my right to treat the whole of India as my domain and to share in the shaping of its political and economic life. To me it seems a sure sign of cowardice to give up what is my patrimony and content myself with a mere fragment of it’.

Azad proposed instead a formula which he had already persuaded the working committee of the Congress to accept : one which secured whatever merit the Pakistan scheme contained, while all its defects – displacement of population, particularly – were avoided. His scheme was to meet this fear by proposing that both sides should accept a solution which ensures that Muslim majority provinces are internally free to develop as they will, but can at the same time influence the centre on all issues which affect India as a whole.²

*‘After four days of searching examination of the State paper issued by the Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy on behalf of the British government, my conviction abides that it is the best document that the British Government could have produced in the circumstances’.*³

‘Pakistan has proved harmful for both Hindus and Muslims. It has shattered the composite culture evolved over a thousand years. The civilization of decency and tolerance has suffered a setback. The two-nation theory is absolutely untenable, for humanity transcends national barriers and religion cannot be a basis for nationhood. If, for example, I embrace Christianity today, I will not suddenly cease to be a Pathan or an Indian or a Pakistani. Similarly, an Englishman will not become an Iranian if he embraces Islam. Religion has no co-relation with nationality’.

² pp. 866-867

³ pp. 868-869

Alternative always available: a confederation of the Sub-continent

“Can we not reverse the process? Muslims of Pakistan, Bangladesh and India should seriously take up the issue. If they are really disillusioned, those who demanded division should come forward to demand unity. If there really is goodwill among these people we can thrash out all the problems. If we could live together under foreign rule, we can surely live together amicably under our own rule”.

– (Gautam Dharmapal, Calcutta, October 31).⁴

“The **British offered him two alternatives – the Pakistan of 1947 and the Mission’s Plan. He (Jinnah) accepted the latter** in deliberate preference to the former. In a private conversation with Stafford Cripps on April 25, **Jinnah accepted** a Union; incredible, as it seems today, his own proposals to the Mission submitted on May 12, envisaged, not partition, but a **confederation**”.⁵

“The only ray of hope in this gloomy picture of the future. consists in the possibility of the ultimate reunification of all independent cultural units into a **United States of India and Pakistan (USIP)** in the same way as the 13 independent states of America were united into USA”.

– (AAK Soze, 9 April 1972).⁶

“Co-existence, the sheet anchor of our foreign policy, after all has no meaning if we do not agree to normalize our relations with our neighbour in the north-west”.

– (Khwaja Ahmad Abbas)⁷

⁴ p. 666

⁵ p.251

⁶ p. 677

⁷ p. 546

J.P. on Partition

CHAIBASA (Bihar), Apr 5.- Mr. J. P. Narain told a public meeting yesterday that the events of the past 17 years had shown that partition had failed to solve the problems of India and Pakistan, reports PTI. On the contrary, it had done much harm to both. Mr Narain said India and Pakistan should reunite politically into “some sort of a confederation or common market” and work together for national uplift and peace. He urged people to enroll themselves as volunteers of peace.



“Ruining the fact that so much money was being “wasted” on a weapon of mass destruction, he said, “Give me the cost of just one atomic bomb; and I shall eradicate leprosy from the face of the earth.”⁸



“The Cabinet Mission’s proposals also have once and for all times cleared all doubts about the question of the division of India. These proposals have made it clear beyond a shadow of doubt that India shall remain undivided, a single unit with a strong Central Government composed of federating units”.⁹



“I particularly value Wali Khan’s observation that “assuming partition was inevitable, we should have conducted it like sensible, prudent and responsible men.” He refers to the division of Scandinavia out of which Norway and Sweden emerged as two separate countries and “peacefully determined their respective boundaries minus looting, arson or bloodshed”.¹⁰



“India and Pakistan are paying in blood and tears the price of slavery even 40 years after the imperial masters left. Pakistan and India can live as brothers if they get out of the hostility syndrome which was imposed upon their minds by the British in pursuit of their imperial objectives”.¹¹

⁸ pp. 746-747

⁹ p. 638

¹⁰ p.417

¹¹ p. 427

Big moment, petty people

“Goethe’s stinging words – the century had given birth to a great epoch but the great moment found a petty generation.”¹²

A few years back a film became very much popular which is not worth-mentioning today at all, but the name of the film is definitely worth-remembering, so much so that the present collection may well be named as *Qissa Kursi ka* : which summarises the Great Tragedy.

Sara Qissa, kursi ka: Partition par ham bunyadi nukta bhool jatey hain; ham bhool jate hain ke Nehru, Jinnah, robot nahiN thE, bilkul ham jaisey insAn thE, khAna khAtE thE, pAni peetE thE, sAns lEtE thE, sotE thE, jAgT hE, muhabbatein kartE thE, nafratein kartE thE, nAqabil-E bardasht had tak nafrat!

(Aur dusri taraf awAm hotE hein jo kal-anaam hotE hein: maweshi, jo bhi unhein hAnk lE jAyE!)

¹² p.255

Sri Prakas, our Ambassador to Pakistan

How I love Bombay:

“Mr. Jinnah received me in his sitting room with heaps of files around him. I gave him the Prime Minister’s message. He was taken aback and almost pleadingly said to me: “Sri Prakasa, don’t break my heart. Tell Jawaharlal not to break my heart. I have built it brick by brick. Who can live in a house like that? What fine verandahs! It is a small house fit only for a small European family or a refined Indian prince. You do not know how I love Bombay. I still look forward to going back there”.

“May I tell the Prime Minister that you want to go back there?” He replied: “Yes you may”.¹³

“Pakistan was created with a hope to have a lasting solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem in India. It is obvious from the tension and the riots that have taken place during the last forty years that the Hindu-Muslim problem has not been solved still. Shri Jinnah also is reported to have said to his physician Col. Elahi Bux, “If now I get an opportunity, I will go to Delhi and tell Jawaharlal Nehru to forget about the follies of the past and become friends again”.¹⁴ (Organizer, dated December 29, 1987).

Jinnah’s love for Bombay:

“Incidentally a book on Jinnah’s last days by his doctor, saying inter alia that he wanted to spend his last days in India, is banned in Pakistan”.¹⁵

Jinnah repenting: Secular Jinnah

“Now, I think we should keep that in front of us as our ideal and you will find that in course of time Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense, because that is the personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the State”. (14 August 1947 speech)¹⁶

“You may belong to any religion or caste or creed – that has nothing to do with the fundamental principle that we are citizens and equal citizens of the state”. (11 August 1947 speech)¹⁷

¹³ pp. 803-805

¹⁴ p. 690

¹⁵ p. 372

¹⁶ p. 549

¹⁷ p. 909__

“We were tired: - Nehru *Lure of Power*

Leonard Mosley, in a very revealing conversation he had with Mr. Nehru in 1960

“Mr. Nehru told him: the truth is that we were tired men and we were getting in years too. Few of us could stand the prospect of going to prison again; and if we stood out for a united India as we wished it, prison obviously awaited us. We saw the fires burning in the Punjab and heard every day killings. The plan for partition offered a way out and we took it”.¹⁸

“The more one delves into the past, the more one is convinced that the *partition of the country was neither inevitable nor desirable*. The tragedy took place *not because it could not have been avoided but because of the lure of power*, which attracted the aging leaders in a desperate hurry to grab it at any cost”.¹⁹

¹⁸ p. 879

¹⁹ p. 473

The consequences of *their* errors, still with us

“Much of the present bitterness in Indo-Pak relations is due to *their* blunders and only a critical review of the past will help us to understand the present and set matters right”.²⁰

“Events in contemporary Pakistan and recurrent communal (*tensions*) in India, currently pose the question, has it solved any problem of the Indian Muslims, who demanded Pakistan as their Eldorado? Even though the answer to the question is in the negative, the melodramatic campaign for partition of the country at the time of the transfer of power in 1947 and the dismal failure of all attempts by Indian nationalism to avoid it, *bear the imprint of destiny in a Greek tragedy*”.²¹

²⁰ pp. 852-853

²¹ p. 810

History has seldom recorded a more unfortunate change

“Muslim League was formed, in 1906, he flatly refused to go to Dacca to join it. Instead, he preferred to attend the Congress session in Calcutta, where Dadabhai Nauroji, from the presidential chair, defined the national goal to be Swaraj. Jinnah did not actually join the Muslim League till 1913, when it had changed its original creed. His work in the Home Rule League, established by Mrs. Annie Besant, his share in promoting the Lucknow pact between the Congress and the League in 1916, his courageous stand against Lord Willingdon’s reactionary regime in Bombay, made his name a household word in India. H.E. Mrs. Sarojini Naidu – now the Governess of the United Provinces – hailed him at that time as the “Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity”. History has seldom recorded a more unfortunate change, or a more untransformation, in the sphere of politics”.²²

²² p. 783

This is the first time that the inner history of the partition of India had been revealed by Lord Mountbatten:

“(It) would be absolutely impossible for him to *retain* that supremacy over the Congress *which he had already obtained* to a great extent”.²³

“Jinnah could never bring himself to play the second fiddle to another; he must be at the helm or nowhere. Better to rule in hell than serve in common with others in Heaven was evidently his ideal; better to be the first Governor-General of a moth-eaten, divided apart, truncated state of Pakistan than a Governor of the largest state in the Federation of Union of India or even its Governor General”.²⁴

“But they did insist that partition must also ensure that no non-Muslim majority areas were in Pakistan. *That automatically meant a partition of the great provinces of the Punjab and Bengal*”. This is the first time that the inner history of the partition of India had been revealed by the highest authority. It had not yet seen the light in India; *and I am glad to be able to print the authorized text*”.

Lord Mountbatten continued: “When I told Mr. Jinnah that I had their provisional agreement to partition, he was over-joyed. When I said that it logically followed that this would involve partition of the Punjab and Bengal he was horrified. He produced the strongest arguments why these provinces should not be partitioned. He said that they had national characteristics and that their partition would be disastrous. I agree, but I said how much more I now feel that the same considerations applied to the partitioning of the whole of India. He did not like that, and started explaining why India had to be partitioned, and so we went round and round the mulberry bush until finally he realized that either he could have United India with an unpartitioned Punjab and Bengal or a Pakistan, and he finally accepted the latter solution. Well, it was *the same old tale : better to rule in hell all by oneself than serve in heaven and share the glory with others. That was just like Jinnah that he was, and lived his life*”.²⁵

²³ p. 785

²⁴ pp.789-790

²⁵ pp.791-792

Nehru chose his moment

“... Nehru chose this moment to launch into what his biographer, Michael Brecher, has described as ‘one of the most fiery and provocative statements in his forty years of public life’. *He was asked by Press representatives whether the approval by congress of the Cabinet Mission Plan meant that they had accepted it in toto. Nehru replied with some petulance that Congress was ‘completely unfettered by agreements and free to meet all situations as they arise’.* ²⁶

“In the circumstances, Nehru’s remarks were a direct act of sabotage. Whether he meant them to be so, in the mistaken belief that Jinnah and the Muslim League were not really a force to be reckoned with, *or whether they were the ham-handed remarks of a politician who did not know when to keep his mouth shut will never be known. It is a subject upon which Nehru nowadays prefers to keep his own counsel. But certainly his speech, as Brecher, his biographer, describes it, was ‘a serious tactical error’.*”²⁷

“Though the compromise formula of the Cabinet mission for a united India was accepted by both the Congress and the Muslim League, Nehru, after assuming the office of Congress president, declared that the Congress was “completely unfettered by agreements and free to meet all situations as they arise”. In the circumstances, *Nehru’s remarks were a direct act of sabotage. In all fairness, Jinnah should not be branded (alone) as the villain of the piece.*” ²⁸

²⁶ pp. 872-873

²⁷ pp. 873/874

²⁸ p. 703

A few thousand English administrators kept order

“A few thousand English administrators kept order, enforced a just and uncorrupt legal system, provided security, communications and a common language, throughout a sub-continent populated by a fifth of the human race”.²⁹

²⁹ p. 853

Partition of Muslims, not of India

“Partition of Muslims as Wali Khan describes it, was a double punishment for the Muslims. Partition did not solve the problems of the Muslims who stayed on in India; and those who left their homes for the Promised Land found themselves unwanted. The bitter violence against Mohajirs (refugees) in Pakistan today is testimony to their tragedy”.³⁰

³⁰ p.334

Interfaith Understanding, the only solution : Aurobindo

“The great Sri Aurobindo advised the country, decades ago: “Hindu-Mohammedan unity cannot be effected by political adjustment or Congress flatteries. We must strive to remove the causes of misunderstanding by a better mutual knowledge and sympathy; We shall make it a main part of our work to place Mohammed and Islam in a new light before our readers, to spread juster views of Mohammedan history and civilization, to appreciate the Mussalman’s place in our national development and the means of harmonizing his communal life with outer life”.

- (K.R. Kulkarni)

(Vide “Karmayogin”, Vol. 2, p.24)³¹

³¹ p.577

**We, the Indians, committed no
mistakes; How can we?
It was Angrez who played the
Satanic role, not we!**

“Laski and Cole formulated the policy of withdrawal of the British from India as a bye-partisan decision, and even Churchill was persuaded to agree. Cole put the argument candidly in amazing simplicity that in order to import food to live, England has to export and she had nothing but war junk to export, for which there were no buyers anywhere in the world. The creation of mutually hostile independent, states always jumping at each other’s throat in South Asia was the only answer, and Hindu Muslim bitterness in India offered an ideal situation for such a solution”.³²

³² p. 711

Dr. Lohia's view

“In his view every Indian leader, with the exception of the Mahatma, was guilty of partition”.³³

³³ p.477

The winner: Religion *or* Culture?

“If regional culture, and not religion, is the basis of nationalism, why West Bengal should continue to be separated from East Bengal since both have the same culture and language? ... *As it is, as long as Bengal remains divided! The two-nation theory will remain alive.* ³⁴

³⁴ p. 675- 676

Has Partition served any useful purpose at all

“I wonder whether the Partition ... has served any useful purpose at all. It has neither solved the so called Hindu-Muslim problem nor has it benefited, in any way, any section of the people of the sub-continent (Rafiq Zakaria)”.³⁵

³⁵ P. 517

Gandhi ji: “Only over my dead body”

“Gandhiji once said that only over my dead body the partition will come”.³⁶

³⁶ P. 881

Iqbal, disowning the idea of Pakistan

A precious letter of Iqbal, disowning the idea of Pakistan.

"...You call me protagonist of the scheme called 'Pakistan'. Pakistan is not my scheme". (Iqbal to Edward John Thompson of Oxford, 1934)

(Why ascribe our ideas to the great *bard* who used to sing "sArey JahAN se Achchha" and died in the undivided India of 1938, long before the passage of the so-called Lahore resolution).

Mohd Iqbal, M.A.
B.Sc. & Co.
Lahore.

4th Dec 1934

My dear Mr. Thompson

I have just read your review of my book. It is excellent & I am grateful to you for the very kind things you have said of me. But you have made one mistake which I cannot let pass and I consider it rather serious. You talk me just up to the point of the scheme called "Pakistan" & then Pakistan is not my scheme. The one that I suggested in my address is the creation of a Muslim Province - i.e. a province having an overwhelming population of Muslims - in the North West of India. This Province will be, according to my scheme, a part of the proposed Indian Federation. Pakistan scheme proposes or suggests federation of Muslim Provinces directly related to England as an separate Dominion. This scheme originated in Cambridge. The author of this scheme the leading think our Muslim Orund Po'tion have recognized the Muslim nation on the basis of the Union on the so-called "a. Nationalism". Yours sincerely, Muhammad Iqbal.

(Iqbal's original letter)